UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,992	07/14/2003	John J. Light	42P16124	5965

8791	7590	04/18/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER
BOTTS, MICHAEL K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/618,992	LIGHT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael K. Botts	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 February 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-12 and 14-30</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-12 and 14-30</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.. This document is in response to the following communication: Applicants

Amendment and Response, which was filed on February 1, 2006.

2. Claims 3 and 13 have been canceled.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-30 are pending and have been examined, with claims

1, 11, 19, 25, and 28 being the independent claims.

4. Figure 4 of the drawings was objected to. Applicant submitted a replacement

drawing that appropriately corrects the grounds for objection. Accordingly, the objection

to Figure 4 is withdrawn.

5. Claim 29 was objected to for a minor error. Applicant has amended claim 29 to

appropriately correct the error. Accordingly, the objection to claim 29 is withdrawn.

6. Claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-30 remain rejected.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1.   **Claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-30** remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Knowlton (PCT Published Application, International Publication Number:

WO 92/16898), which was published October 1, 1992, in the English Language

[hereinafter "Knowlton"].

Regarding **independent claim 1, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

> *A method of displaying a document on a viewing screen, comprising:*
>
> *enabling display of at least one page of the document on the viewing*
> *screen;*
>
> *enabling greeking of a portion of the at least one page prior to enabling*
> *display of the at least one page; and*
>
> *enabling a user to selectively ungreek at least a portion of the greeked*
> *portion of the at least one page.*

(See, Knowlton, claim 1, in relevant part: "A system for displaying in an available area

of a display screen, . . . the system comprising: (A) a display screen, . . . (C) legible

display means for displaying on the display screen a portion of the document in legible

form, . . . (E) a pointing device for use by a user of the system, (F) movement control

means responsive to the pointing device for directing operation of the drawing control

means, the legible display means, and the greeking means to change the portion of the

document that is displayed by the legible display means such that a window of legibility

is movable through the greeking by the user.")

Regarding **dependent claim 2, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

> *The method according to claim 1 wherein enabling greeking of the portion of the at least one page further comprises at least one of:*

> *enabling the user to selectively greek the portion of the at least one page; and*

> *enabling a third party to selectively greek the portion of the at least one page.*

(See, Knowlton, page 14, stating: "The present display arrangement can be used for a document editor; the present inventive display capabilities can be added to an editor, or editing capabilities can be added to the illustrative embodiment described above. It can be used by a window manager, where the window manager is responsible for providing the user ways to view (through windows) "screens" larger than the window through which they are being viewed. The present invention could be used with a data retrieval system when search results are too extensive to be legible on the screen at one time; the tags could be used to identify locations of words that were the subject of the search, showing the words as they actually appear at their respective locations in the search results . . .."

It is noted that it is inherent in the program taught by Knowlton that a third-party could selectively apply the SCROLL greeking program to an entire document or a select portion. The ability of the user to selectively greek and un-greek portions of the document is the crux of the Knowlton teaching. See, Knowlton, pages 5-6, stating:

"The scroll system presents to a user of the system a visually compressed display of a document. Fig. 4 is a picture of a display screen with a document displayed mostly in compressed form, with a window of legible text. The document that is displayed in Fig. 4 and in other similar figures is the computer program that is listed in the Appendix to this Detailed Description. The display presented by the scroll system is somewhat like a vertically compressed display of a document over which are placed two bars that magnify vertically (as shown in Fig. 5), creating two windows of legible text. The user is able to discern gross shapes in the compressed text, and can read the text in each of the two magnified areas. Controls provided by the system permit the user to move the 'magnifiers,' and thereby select the portions of the document to be readable.")

Regarding **dependent claim 3: Cancelled**

Regarding **dependent claim 4, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

> *The method according to claim 1 wherein enabling greeking of the portion of the at least one page further comprises enabling an application to greek the portion of the at least one page.*

(See, Knowlton, page 4, stating: "An illustrative embodiment of the present invention (referred to below as 'the scroll system') is implemented with a computer system and a computer program (referred to below as SCROLL)." See, also, Knowlton, page 17-29, providing the SCROLL program.)

Regarding **dependent claim 5**, Knowlton teaches:

> *The method according to claim 4 wherein the application comprises at least one of a web browser, a word processing application, a spreadsheet and an electronic mail application.*

(See, Knowlton, pages 15-16, stating: "The term 'document' has been used to describe the body of data through which the present invention provides navigation. In the present context, 'document' includes any body of data that includes text, such as text files, word processing documents, database records, compound documents."

See also, Knowlton, page 14, stating: "The present display arrangement can be used for a document editor; the present inventive display capabilities can be added to an editor, or editing capabilities can be added to the illustrative embodiment described above. It can be used by a window manager, where the window manager is responsible for providing the user ways to view (through windows) "screens" larger than the window through which they are being viewed. The present invention could be used with a data retrieval system when search results are too extensive to be legible on the screen at one time; the tags could be used to identify locations of words that were the subject of the search, showing the words as they actually appear at their respective locations in the search results . . ..")

Regarding **dependent claim 6, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

> *The method according to claim 1 further comprising enabling the user to re-greek the portion of the at least one page that is ungreeked.*

(See, Knowlton, claim 1, part (F), stating: ""movement control means responsive to the pointing device for directing operation of the drawing control means, the legible display means, and the greeking means to change the portion of the document that is displayed by the legible display means such that a window of legibility is movable through the greeking by the user.")

Regarding **dependent claim 7, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

> The method according to claim 6 wherein enabling the user to re-greek the portion of the at least one page that is ungreeked comprises at least one of utilizing a single keystroke, a combination of keystrokes and a mouse gesture to re-greek the portion of the at least one page.

(See, Knowlton, claim 1, part (F), stating: ""movement control means responsive to the pointing device for directing operation of the drawing control means, the legible display means, and the greeking means to change the portion of the document that is displayed by the legible display means such that a window of legibility is movable through the greeking by the user." See also, Knowlton, claim 6, stating, in part: "The computer system of claim 1 wherein the pointing device is a mouse . . ..")

Regarding **dependent claim 8, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

> The method according to claim 1 wherein enabling greeking of the portion of the at least one page further comprises enabling greeking of a selected region in the at least one page.

(See, Knowlton, Figures 4-12, teaching the display of windows of non-greeked text

within sections of greeked text. See also, Knowlton, pages 2-3, stating: "Windows of

legible text are movable through the greeking, as if magnifiers were moved across a

distant or miniature document." And see, Knowlton, page 5, stating: "Controls provided

by the system permit the user to move the 'magnifiers', and thereby select the portions

of the document to be readable.")

Regarding **dependent claim 9, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

> *The method according to claim 8 wherein enabling greeking of the*
>
> *selected region in the at least one page further comprises at least one of:*
>
> > *enabling greeking of a character in the at least one page;*
> >
> > *enabling greeking of a word in the at least one page;*
> >
> > *enabling greeking of a line in the at least one page;*
> >
> > *enabling greeking of a paragraph in the at least one page;*
> >
> > *enabling greeking of a page in the at least one page; and*
> >
> > *enabling greeking of a figure in the at least one page.*

(See, Knowlton, page 7, stating: "Alternatively, greeking cold be computed on the basis

of a one-to-one correspondence between characters and units of greeking.")

Regarding **dependent claim 10, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

> *The method according to claim 8 wherein enabling greeking of the portion*
>
> *of the at least one page further comprises at least two of:*

enabling greeking of the character in the at least one page;

enabling greeking of the word in the at least one page that includes the

character;

enabling greeking of the line in the at least one page that includes at least

the character and the word;

enabling greeking of the paragraph in the at least one page that includes

at least one of the character, the word and the line; and

enabling greeking the page in the at least one page that includes at least

one of the character, the word, the line and the paragraph.

(See, Knowlton, page 7, stating: "Alternatively, greeking cold be computed on the basis

of a one-to-one correspondence between characters and units of greeking." See also,

Knowlton, page 16, stating, in part: "In the illustrative embodiment, a line of the greeked

representation corresponds to a line of characters in the document . . ..")

Regarding **independent claim 11, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

An article comprising a machine-accessible medium having stored thereon

instructions that, when executed by a machine, cause the machine to:

enabling display of at least one page of the document on the viewing

screen;

enable greeking of a portion of the at least one page prior to enabling

display of the at least one page; and

enabling a user to selectively ungreek at least a portion of the greeked

portion of the at least one page.

(Claim 1, above, incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed herein

and, accordingly, claim 11 is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 12, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

The article according to claim 11 wherein the instructions, when executed

by the machine, further cause the machine to perform at least one of:

enabling the user to selectively greek the portion of the at least one page;

and

enabling a third party to greek the portion of the at least one page.

(Claim 2, above, incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed herein

and, accordingly, claim 12 is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 13: Cancelled**

Regarding **dependent claim 14, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

The article according to claim 11 wherein the instructions, when executed

by the machine, further cause the machine to enable an application to greek the

portion of the at least one page.

(Claim 13, above, incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed

herein and, accordingly, claim 14 is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 15, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

>.The article according to claim 11 wherein the instructions, when executed
>
>by the machine, further cause the machine to enable the user to re-greek at least
>
>the portion of the at least one page that is ungreeked.

(Claim 3, above, incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed herein

and, accordingly, claim 15 is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 16, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

>The article according to claim 11 wherein the instructions, when executed
>
>by the machine, further cause the machine to enable greeking of a selected
>
>region in the at least one page.

(See, Knowlton, pages 5-6, stating: Controls provided by the system permit the user to

move the 'magnifiers', and thereby select the portions of the document to be readable.

When the two windows are moved adjacent to each other, they become latched (as

shown in Fig. 40 and can be moved as a single large window." The greeking and

ungreeking of the document is the crux of the Knowlton invention. If this claim was

intended to limit claim 11 such that the document was selectively greeked by the

program alone, then it is similarly rejected that on the grounds that it is inherent in the

program to greek all or parts of a particular document. As recognized in Knowlton, the

document itself is broad. See, Knowlton, pages 15-16, stating: "The term 'document'

has been used to describe the body of data through which the present invention

provides navigation. In the present context, 'document' includes any body of data that

includes text, such as text files, word processing documents, database records, compound documents. The data of a 'document' may be stored in a file on a mass storage device, or may be more transitory in nature (e.g., database search results assembled at the time the user requests their presentation).")

Regarding **dependent claim 17, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

> *The article according to claim 16 wherein the instructions, when executed by the machine, further cause the machine to perform at least one of:*

> *enabling greeking of a character in the at least one page;*

> *enabling greeking of a word in the at least one page;*

> *enabling greeking of a line in the at least one page;*

> *enabling greeking of a paragraph in the at least one page;*

> *enabling greeking of a page in the at least one page; and*

> *enabling greeking of a figure in the at least one page.*

(Claim 9, above, incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed herein and, accordingly, claim 17 is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 18, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

> *The article according to claim 17 wherein the instructions, when executed by the machine, further cause the machine to perform at least two of:*

> *enabling greeking of the character in the at least one page;*

enabling greeking of the word in the at least one page that includes the

character;

enabling greeking of the line in the at least one page that includes at least

one of the character and the word;

enabling greeking of the paragraph in the at least one page that includes

at least one of the character, the word and the line; and

enabling greeking of the page in the at least one page that includes at

least one of the character, the word, the line and the paragraph.

(Claim 10, above, incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed

herein and, accordingly, claim 18 is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **independent claim 19, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

A method of displaying a document, comprising:

enabling display of at least one page of a greeked document; and

enabling a user to selectively ungreek a portion of the at least one page for

viewing.

(Claim 1, above, incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed herein

and, accordingly, claim 19 is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 20, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

The method according to claim 19 wherein enabling display of at least one

page of the greeked document further comprises at least one of:

enabling display of at least one page of the document having a greeked

portion according to the user's preferences; and

enabling display of at least one page of the document having a greeked

portion according to a third party's preference.

(Claim 2, above, incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed herein and, accordingly, claim 20 is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 21, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

The method according to claim 19 wherein enabling display of the at least

one page of the document having the greeked portion further comprises enabling

display of a selected greeked region of the greeked portion of the at least one

page of the document.

(Claim 3, above, incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed herein and, accordingly, claim 21 is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 22, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

The method according to claim 21 wherein enabling display of the

selected greeked region in the greeked portion of the at least one page of the

document further comprises enabling display of at least one of:

a greeked character in the greeked portion of the at least one page of the

document;

a greeked word in the greeked portion of the at least one page of the

document;

a greeked line in the greeked portion of the at least one page of the

document;

a greeked paragraph in the greeked portion of the at least one page of the

document; a greeked page in the document; and

a greeked figure in the greeked portion of the at least one page of the

document.

(Claim 9, above, incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed herein

and, accordingly, claim 22 is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 23, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

The method according to claim 22 wherein enabling display of the

document having the greeked portion further comprises enabling display of at

least two of:

the greeked character in the greeked portion of the at least one page;

the greeked word in the greeked portion of the at least one page that

includes the greeked character;

the greeked line in the greeked portion of the at least one page that

includes at least one of the greeked character and the greeked word;

the greeked paragraph in the greeked portion of the at least one page that

includes at least one of the greeked character, the greeked word and the

greeked line; and

the greeked page in the greeked portion of the at least one page that

includes at least one of the greeked character, the greeked word, the greeked

line and the greeked paragraph.

(Claim 10, above, incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed

herein and, accordingly, claim 23 is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 24, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

The method according to claim 23 wherein enabling the user to selectively

ungreek the portion of the greeked portion of the at least one page for viewing

further comprises enabling the user to selectively ungreek at least one of:

the greeked character in the greeked portion of the at least one page;

the greeked word in the greeked portion of the at least one page that

includes the greeked character;

the greeked line in the greeked portion of the at least one page that

includes at least one of the greeked character and the greeked word;

the greeked paragraph in the greeked portion of the at least one page that

includes at least one of the greeked character, the greeked word and the

greeked paragraph; and

the greeked page in the greeked portion of the at least one page that

includes at least one of the greeked character, the greeked word, the greeked

line and the greeked paragraph.

(Claim 9, above, incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed herein

and, accordingly, claim 24 is rejected along the same rationale. Also see, Knowlton,

claim 1, teaching a legible display means and a movement control means for

ungreeking, or making legible, variable portions of greeked text. See also, Knowlton,

page 7 teaching that greeking, and, inherently, ungreeking, could be at the character

level and go up in size from there.)

Regarding **independent claim 25, as currently amended**, Knowlton teaches:

A system for displaying a document, comprising:

a processor capable of executing instructions to selectively greek a portion

of at least one page of the document, the processor further capable of executing

instructions to selectively ungreek the greeked portion of the at least one page in

the document; and

a display device capable of displaying the at least one page of the

document in a greeked format and an ungreeked format.

(See, Knowlton, Figures 2 and 3, and Knowlton pages 4 and 5 describing prior art

hardware used to run the SCROLL program. See also, Knowlton, claim 1, teaching a

greeking means, a legible display means, a drawing control means, a pointing device,

and a movement control means, all for use in a system for selectively greeking and

ungreeking a document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 26**, Knowlton teaches:

> The system according to claim 25 wherein the instructions comprise an
>
> application.

(See, Knowlton, pages 17-29, Appendix, identifying instructions according to the

teaching of a system for selectively greeking and ungreeking a document.)

Regarding **dependent claim 27**, Knowlton teaches:

> The system according to claim 26 wherein the application comprises at
>
> least one of a web browser, a word processing application, a spreadsheet and an
>
> electronic mail application.

(Claim 5, above, incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that claimed herein

and, accordingly, claim 27 is rejected along the same rationale.)

Arguments

Applicants traversed the rejection of claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) in an

Amendment filed February 1, 2006. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered

but they are not persuasive. Claims 1-27 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Regarding claims 1-27, applicants argue that the examiner failed to establish a prima facie case of unpatentability in that the cited prior art failed to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. Specifically, Applicants argue regarding independent claims 1, 11, 19, and 25 that the cited prior art, Knowlton, fails to teach a scheme of at least the elements of enabling display of at least one page of a document on a viewing screen and enabling a user to selectively ungreek at least a portion of the at least one page. See, Applicants Amendment, filed February 1, 2006, pages 9-11.

It is noted that the limitation of a document "on a viewing screen" was only recently added to claim 1 by the Amendment filed February 1, 2006, and was not present in the original claim 1. Therefore, there was no omission of a prima facie case of unpatentability of that limitation because it was not presented.

It is further noted that the limitation of "at least one page of a document" was only recently added to the claims by the Amendment filed February 1, 2006, and was not present in the original claims. Therefore, there was no omission of a prima facie case of unpatentability of that limitation because it was not presented. Therefore, the scheme to "selectively ungreek at least a portion of a greeked portion of the at least one page" was not presented in the original application. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-27 remains.

Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   **Claims 28-30** remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Bloomberg (U.S. Patent 5,765,176, issued July 9, 1998) [hereinafter "Bloomberg"].

Regarding **independent claim 28, as currently amended**, Bloomberg teaches:

> *A method of enabling secure viewing of a document, comprising:*
>
> *receiving a request for at least one page of the document from a user;*
>
> *greeking at least a portion of the at lest one page of the document; and*
>
> *transmitting the at lest one page of the document to the user.*

(See, Bloomberg, col. 6, lines 12-24, stating: "The iconic image includes embedded

encoded data in a position where the reduced version of text in the original text image

would appear, and are rendered as a series of rectangular blocks. At the reduced size,

these rectangular blocks appear as straight lines ad have the appearance of 'greeked'

text, a technique that is used to replace the rendering of actual text when rendering

actual text reduces performance or efficiency of an operation. Thus, a viewer of the

iconic image who is unable to see a reduced version of the text is not likely to interpret

the 'greeked' text as a signal of the presence of embedded data, but is more likely to

interpret it as a normal consequence of the image reduction operation."

See also, Bloomberg, col. 22, line 59 through col. 23, line 2, teaching sending an

iconic version of a document via the World Wide Web in response to a request from a

user.)

Regarding **dependent claim 29, as currently amended**, Bloomberg teaches:

The method according to claim 28 further comprising

receiving a request from the user to ungreek the portion of the at lest one

page of the document; and

ungreeking at least a portion of the greeked portion of the at least one

page of the document in response to the user request.

(See, Bloomberg, Figures 5 and 14, and col. 23, lines 3-19, teaching the use of an

iconic image by a user in a request for retrieval of a decoded document from a server.)

Regarding **dependent claim 30, as currently amended**, Bloomberg teaches:

The method according to claim 29 further comprising at least one of transmitting

the ungreeked portion of the at least one page of the document to the user; and

retransmitting the document including the ungreeked portion of the at least one

page to the user.

(See, Bloomberg, Figure 15, teaching the printing of the un-coded, ungreeked

document, along with the iconic, greeked, document.)

Arguments

Applicants traversed the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claims 28-30 in an

Amendment filed February 1, 2006. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered

but they are not persuasive. Claims 28-30 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Regarding **claims 28-30**, Applicants state without argument that the

amendments to the claims "more clearly define the scope" and overcome the rejection

under Bloomberg. The amendments to the claims changed the limitation of a

"document" to "at least one page of a document."

Bloomberg teaches greeking documents, and specifically teaches greeking

documents by pages. See, Bloomberg, figures 1-21, and col. 5, line 63 through col. 8,

line 10, specifically col. 6 lines 12-23. Greeking of a document page by page is the

same as greeking "at least one page of a document." It is noted that Bloomberg even

teaches the same motivation cited by Applicants, being "secure viewing" of a document.

See, preamble to claim 28. See also, Bloomberg, col. 6 lines 12-23. Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to greek one page or many pages of

a document for the advantageous benefit of security of the document. Accordingly, the

rejection of claims 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) remains.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS for the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed

until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened

statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension

fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory

action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX

MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-

5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00

EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb

DOUG HUTTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100